COMMENTS ON THE POSSIBLE USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS AND OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE COMMISSION BY Dr. HENNING LEMCHE, Z.N.(S.) 1044 and Z.N.(S.) 1102–1107

(see volume 21, pages 35–57)

By Robert Burn (3 *Nantes Street*, *Newtown*, *Geelong*, *Victoria*, *Australia*)

The seven applications by Dr. Henning Lemche to the Commission containing recommendations for the possible use of the Plenary Powers and proposed additions to the Official List are deserving of the highest praise. Dr. Lemche has undertaken a tremendous task in attempting to unravel the complexities of the nomenclatorial problems of the Eolidoidean Nudibranchia. I for one am very grateful to Dr. Lemche for his actions in this direction, because, whether or not his applications are approved, they will remain a valuable source of reference for many years to come.

There are however two comments arising from Dr. Lemche's applications which I wish to place before the Commission.

1. Z.N.(S.) 1105, pages 50–51. It will be a pity to see *Cratena* Bergh, 1864, replaced by *Rizzolia* Trinchese, 1877, just when the former taxon has been accepted in its type-species concept. Marcus (1957, *J. Linn. Soc. London*, Zool. 43 (292) : 472) has introduced *Cratena kaoruae* as a new Brazilian species and later on Marcus and Marcus (1960, *Ak. Wiss. Lit. Mainz*, 1959 (12) : 922) added *Cratena phylloda* from the Maldive Islands. The writer has introduced *Cratena macphersonae* (1962, *Mem. Nat. Mus. Melbourne*, 25 : 118) from the Victorian coast-line. These three species are each generically placed according to Macnae's research on the genus (1954, *Ann. Natal Mus.*, 13 : 9, 28). I do believe that the confusion surrounding *Cratena* has righted itself in the last decade; the substitution of *Rizzolia* will do little to clarify the present state of the nomenclature.

With regard to the species of *Rizzolia* found in the literature, it should be noted that one species at least, *R. australis* Bergh (1884, *Rep. Scient. Res.* "*Challenger*", 26, Zool. 10 : 27), is generically different to the *Cratena* (synonym *Rizzolia*) genus concept, particularly in so far as the shape of the liver groups is concerned. *R. australis* is a junior synonym of *Flabellina ornata* Angas (1864, *J. Conchyliol.*, ser. 3, 4 : 67), the type-species of the genus *Austraeolis* Burn (1962, *Mem. Nat. Mus. Melbourne*, 25 : 120).

2. Z.N.(S.) 1106, pages 52–55. It seems that *Trinchesia* Ihering, 1879, is the valid replacement for the genus concept of the species hitherto referred to *Cratena* auctt. (nec Bergh, 1864) and *Catriona* Winckworth, 1941, though the latter name remains available as it has a different type-species to that of *Trinchesia*. In a paper published since Dr. Lemche submitted his application to the Commission, the writer has proposed (1963, *J. Malac. Soc. Aust.*, 7 : 13) a new subgenus, *Eurycatriona*, of the genus now to be called *Trinchesia*. Both *Eurycatriona* and *Trinchesia* have the same type-species, *Doris caerulea* Montagu, 1804. Therefore, *Eurycatriona* is a very junior synonym of *Trinchesia* and my subgenus must revert to the latter taxon. The subgenus *Catriona* formulated in the same publication, remains in use.

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO GRANT PRECEDENCE TO THE FAMILY-GROUP NAME CUTHONIDAE OVER TERGIPEDIDAE AND TO STABILIZE SOME SPECIFIC NAMES IN THE GENUS KNOWN AS *EUBRANCHUS* FORBES, 1838. Z.N.(S.) 1044

(see present volume, pages 35–39)

By David Heppell (*Dept. of Zoology*, *The University*, *Glasgow*, *Scotland*)

Malacologists will be grateful for Dr. Lemche's scholarly presentation of many of the problems complicating the nomenclature of that difficult and taxonomically still unstable group, the Nudibranchia. The pruning away of old *nomina dubia* and the addition of established taxa to the appropriate Official Lists are valuable contributions to nomenclatural stability. Dr. Lemche's seven applications in Part 1 of the *Bulletin of*

Zoological Nomenclature **21** involve seventy-five separate proposals, many of which are interdependent: it should not be assumed, however, that an " all or nothing " solution is the only one possible. In the case of Z.N.(S.) 1104 and Z.N.(S.) 1107, I am in complete agreement with all of the proposals made and recommend their approval to the Commission. In the case of the other five applications, however, while supporting unconditionally many of the proposals made, I should like to bring a number of alternative proposals before the Commission for their consideration.

I would not agree that the quotation from Cuvier, 1805, necessarily shows that the name " *tergipes* " was not used there in a vernacular sense. If we were to substitute for instance, " *éolides* " for " *tergipes* " in the relevant sentence, it will be seen that no article " les " is required. If we were to condone the acceptance of such a usage without comment, we should be opening the door to too many other quasi-vernacular names of a similar nature. Neither can I agree, on turning to Risso's work, that " there is no *Tergipes* Risso, 1818". On the contrary, Risso's usage fulfils all the requirements for the valid establishment of a new genus, and includes two new nominal species, *T. dicquemari* and *T. brochi*. Unfortunately, Dr. Lemche does not tell us whether he considers Risso's species to be referrable to his concept of the genus, nor are they mentioned by Mme. Pruvot-Fol in her work on the French opisthobranchs, although Nice is the type-locality for both species. On reading Risso's descriptions, however, it does not appear that they are congeneric with *Limax tergipes* Forskål and, probably, both his species should be considered *nomina dubia* and rejected under the plenary powers. *Tergipes* Risso would not, in any case, be a satisfactory substitute for *Tergipes* Cuvier, as it contains no suitable type-species. The name does, however, unquestionably exist, and I believe it should be placed on the Official Index as a junior homonym. I would, therefore, support Dr. Lemche's proposal to place *Tergipes* Cuvier, 1805, on the Official List, but consider that this action would require the use of the plenary powers.

Every taxonomist knows that the nomenclatural type, in its modern concept, is *not* necessarily the most typical or representative element of the taxon based on it. I find it difficult, therefore, to understand Dr. Lemche's concern at the name TERGIPEDIDAE being founded on the " atypical " genus *Tergipes*. I know of no-one who objects to the family name CARDIIDAE, for instance, on the grounds that it is based on the atypical genus *Cardium* to which only two or three species are properly referrable. Before the foundation of the modern type concept, it was certainly accepted practice to change the type, be it specimen, species, or genus, in accordance with the changing subjective limits of the taxon, and it would appear that Dr. Lemche is now advocating a partial return to such a fluid interpretation.

The name TERGIPEDIDAE in its wider sense is found not only in Thiele but also in other works of reference. Winckworth, who had a particular interest in nudibranch systematics and nomenclature, used it in his check-list of British marine Mollusca and this usage has, moreover, been followed by all recent British workers. Of Thiele's action, Dr. Lemche says: " Thiele, uniting these two family groups [CRATENINAE and TERGIPEDINAE], followed the rule of using the oldest generic name as the basis for the family name, thus accepting TERGIPEDIDAE. . . . The viewpoint behind this action has never been accepted by the Commission nor by any Congress." This statement is not only irrelevant but presumptuous, for how can Dr. Lemche pretend to know Thiele's motives. Thiele's action was precisely that *laid down by the present Code* for the union of family-group names and is, therefore, *acceptable*. A family name may be based on any of the included nominal genera [Article 64], the oldest competing valid family-group name having priority [Article 23(d)]. The viewpoint that a family-group name should be based on the most " typical " of the included genera is certainly no more than a non-retroactive recommendation [64A].

If the specific name *lacinulata* be placed on the Official Index, there would seem to be no real reason for demanding that *exigua* and *pallida* be placed on the Official List, once this " threat to stability " has been removed. There would of course be no objection to such action were it not that such a course might prejudice to some extent the taxonomic judgment of future workers, especially in the event of Dr. Lemche's request for the suppression of the specific name *tricolor* [Z.N.(S.) 1102] being acceded to. This point is discussed in my comment on that application below.

In conclusion, I support the following proposals of Dr. Lemche in the present application, and recommend their approval by the International Commission: (1) (b) (i), (ii) and (iii), (2) (b); (3) (a), (b), (c) and (d), though the last two I would consider unnecessary if (1) (b) (i) is accepted; (4); (5) (a) (i), (ii) and (iii); (5) (b), (c), (d) and (e); and (6) (b). For the rest, I beg leave to lay the following alternative proposals before the Commission for their consideration:

(1) to use the plenary powers:

(a) to validate the probable vernacular usage of the name " *tergipes* " in a generic sense by Cuvier, 1805;

(b) to suppress the following specific names for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy:
 (i) *dicquemari* Risso, 1818, as published in the binomen *Tergipes dicquemari*;
 (ii) *brochi* Risso, 1818, as published in the binomen *Tergipes brochi*;

(2) to place the family-group name CUTHONIDAE Odhner, 1934 (type-genus *Cuthona* Alder & Hancock, 1855), on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology [but without a grant of precedence over TERGIPEDIDAE];

(3) to place the generic name *Tergipes* Cuvier, 1805 (gender : masculine) (validated under the plenary powers in (1) (a) above), type-species by monotypy *Limax tergipes* Forskål, 1775, on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology;

(4) to place the generic name *Tergipes* Risso, 1818 (a junior homonym of *Tergipes* Cuvier, 1805), on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology;

(5) to place the following specific names, suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) (b) above, on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology;

(a) *dicquemari* Risso, 1818, as published in the binomen *Tergipes dicquemari*;

(b) *brochi* Risso, 1818, as published in the binomen *Tergipes brochi*.

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED DESIGNATION UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS OF A TYPE-SPECIES FOR *EUBRANCHUS* FORBES, 1838, WITH SUPPRESSION OF SEVERAL NOMINA DUBIA: Z.N.(S.) 1102

(see present volume, pages 40–44)

By David Heppell (*Dept. of Zoology, The University, Glasgow, Scotland*)

I should like to make an objection to the proposal to suppress the specific name *tricolor*, the sole original species of the genus *Eubranchus*, and to the proposed consequent transfer of that generic name to a new concept based on a type-species hitherto considered by many authors not to be specifically distinct from *E. tricolor*. However convenient Dr. Lemche's proposals may be for Scandinavian zoologists, it is doubtful whether many British malacologists would consider that this is a case where the designation of a new type-species, with suppression of the name commonly in use hitherto, contributes anything towards the stability of accepted usage of the generic name. Of the genus *Eubranchus*, Pruvot-Fol, 1954, says: " Un grand nombre d'espèces ont été attribuées à ce genre; mais seul la couleur servait à distinguer toutes celles d'Europe, sauf trois. Aujourd'hui on tend à en réunir la plupart en une seule espèce [*tricolor*] très variable (quant à la couleur seulement), aucune différence n'ayant pu être décelée dans leur anatomie, leur dentition, leur mâchoires; les diverses espèces sont trouvées de